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Abstract
This study was undertaken to evaluate the Department of Education (DepEd) instructional materials used in teaching Meranaw language in Grade 1, School Year 2013-2014. Instructional materials are valuable aid in the language learning of the students. The result of the study could give benefits to the teachers on how to make necessary adjustments in the materials to suit the needs and interests of the pupils and to maximize its use in the delivery of teaching and learning. The seventy-nine (79) participants of the research were all Grade 1 teachers of selected public schools in Marawi City. Marawi City is the city capital of the Lanao del Sur, an area part of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) located in Mindanao, the second largest island of the Philippines. This research used the descriptive-evaluative design and utilized a researcher-made questionnaire which was adapted and modified from various sources. The data gathered were statistically treated and interviews with the teachers were also conducted. The overall evaluation verdict—moderately agreed. One can conclude that something must still be lacking; the materials are not irreproachable or perfect; they could stand more refinement and enrichment in some parts. Researchers recommend that there should be more training programs to be organized, enlist the cooperation of experts or scholars from different fields such as folklore and literature and a proper monitoring, evaluation and documentation of the MTB-MLE program.
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Introduction
Philippine education is a product of a long history of struggle. Changes introduced over time did not seem to match the high hopes of the Filipino people. The magical words that would open the door and provide the answer or panacea to bridge the gap between aspirations and reality remain elusive, hence, the quest for the secret formula continues. Presently, the Philippine educational system is besieged by several issues that need to be addressed in order to improve
the delivery of education to the largest number of the population. To provide high quality education to its clientele is the most important mission of every educational institution.

A very recent innovation in the school system is the implementation of K to 12 curriculum launched by the Department of Education last 2012, setting into motion the radical restructuring of basic education system with kindergarten now a general requirement, six years in elementary (Grade 1-6), four years of junior high school (Grade 7-10) and two years of senior high school (Grades 11-12) (www.gov.ph/k-12/). Students can choose an area of specialization in the final two years, whether it be in the performing arts, vocational training, sports or agriculture. The K to 12, touted as the centerpiece of the Educational Reform Program, is a long overdue response to the fact that the same scheme has been in implementation in most countries in the world (www.gov.ph/k-12/).

However, the course of the implementation of K to 12, like romance in realistic stories, is proving to be far from smooth. Already, misgivings skepticism, and confusion cloud the atmosphere. It poses enormous challenges to teachers as any new curriculum does. Although guidelines for the implementation of the K to 12 basic education curriculum may not be that radically different from those employed in the old curriculum, it is clear these have raised more questions than answers. One of the major features of the K t 12 Curriculum is the use of Mother Tongue-Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) from Preschool to Grade 3. Pupils from Preschool to Grade 3 will be taught in their mother tongue or the first language they learned from birth. Education officials were convinced that this new policy will facilitate effective learning since young children who are proficient in their mother tongue will be less hesitant to speak up in class. (www.gov.ph/k-12/).

MTB-MLE is hoped to solve the language problem or deficiency that hinders active participation in class and accounts in a large measure for the achievement gap between groups of students. The achievement gap has grown wide enough “to engulf whole communities and populations of students” (Albakrawi, 2013). In the United States, the most severely affected are those who speak minority languages, the “poor whites”, “the children of color” and children of immigrants or recent arriviste (Fitzpatrick, 2011). In the Philippines, the groups most affected are the children of the poor, the children of minority groups particularly the Lumads or Indigenous Peoples of Mindanao, and those who speak minority languages, in their words, non-Filipino and non-English speaking groups. As stipulated in the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP), the two official mediums of instruction are Pilipino (now spelled Filipino) and English; however, in the same 1974 DECS Order No. 25, based on policies approved by the National Board of Education, there is a provision that mandates the use of vernaculars in the locality or place where the school is located “as an auxiliary medium of instruction” (Nolasco, 2012), in the early years of schooling, specifically, Grades I and II.

Furthermore, language barriers can cause intense frustration because a person may feel inadequate, fearful of shame caused by committing errors and being ridiculed or laughed at by others, and sad for not being able to understand and share simple ideas. People who are not able to speak the native language may grow frustrated at the missed opportunities, embarrassing mistakes, serious consequences and negative attitudes from others (Mertens, 2012).

Thus after much brain-racking search for a solution to the problem, the Department of Education (DepEd) resolved to make a “leap of faith,” a crucial shift making mother tongue a medium of instruction and a subject in the first three years of schooling. This was institutionalized under DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009. DepEd Order No.16, s.2012, otherwise
known as Guidelines on the implementation of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) stipulated that MTB-MLE shall be implemented in all public schools, specifically in Kindergarten, Grades 1, 2, and 3 as a component of the K to 12 Basic Education Program. The MTB-MLE shall support the “Every Child a Reader and a Writer by Grade 1” goal. The order also authorized implementation in two modes: as a learning/subject area and as a medium of instruction. The mother tongue as a subject will focus on the development of beginning reading and fluency from Grade 1 to 3. The learner’s mother tongue (L₁) shall be used as the medium of instruction (MOI) in all domains/learning areas from Kindergarten through Grade 3, except Filipino (L₂) and English (L₃) (http://www.gov.ph/k-12/).

A news article in Philippine Daily Inquirer by Calleja (2012) reported that some Grades 1 and 7 teachers saw the lack of materials help them cope with that proponents of the K to 12 system called a “spiraling approach” to learning as the great challenge ahead for the program. Immelda Paddayunan, a Grade 1 teacher at Toro Hills Elementary School in Project 8, Quezon City, disclosed she was still confused on how to teach her subjects, describing a training program she attended from May 28 to June 1 as “hastily done”. “We are not yet ready,” is her fearless opinion aired and published in the Philippine Daily Inquirer. These teachers are among the 150,000, who will be working the year round on the curriculum for Grades 1-2 and Grade 7 and 8 as part of the DepEd’s gradual implementation of the K to 12 education program, replacing the old 10-year system. They are expected to teach the new curriculum to these pupils this school year even if they were not trained only for the lessons intended to be taught in the first and second quarters (Calleja, 2012).

The researchers heard many other complaints from elementary teachers particularly non-Maranaw teachers in the implementation of mother-tongue (MTB-MLE) which is Maranaw language. By their own admission, they ended up not using the instructional materials released by DepEd simply because they could not understand and speak the Maranaw language. These were the cues needed by the researchers to elicit more feedbacks from teachers in Grade 1 from different schools regarding the impact of these localized materials provided by DepEd. Their evaluation and assessment based on the performance of their pupils would be a major contribution to the national agenda of designing nativized materials tailored to the needs of these pupils under the MTB-MLE scheme to ensure its appropriateness for the success of K to 12 curriculum.

Method

Participants

The respondents of the study were the Grade 1 teachers in selected public schools deployed in Marawi City who are handling Mother Tongue (Meranaw) as subject. This particular participants was chosen since they form the first phalanx – the frontline mentors of the youth in their formative years - and are therefore expected to have a wealth of firsthand experiences in terms of transmitting basic knowledge to their fresh minds.

Design

This study used the descriptive research design to lay or set the ground for an evaluation. Data gathered were both includes quantitative and qualitative data that are considered as salient points to shed light on the phenomenon of interest or overall worth of the instructional materials used by Grade 1 teachers in DepEd.
Materials
The researchers made use of a questionnaire adapted and modified based on different sources containing the criteria in the evaluation of instructional materials (Appendix 1).

Procedure
Before developing the items of the questionnaire, the researchers reviewed the literature on material evaluation and other related topics, conflated or put together different principles and criteria for evaluating instructional materials formulated by different authorities in the field. Letters requesting official permission from the school principals to conduct the research in their respective schools were prepared and delivered personally.

Questionnaire administration was preceded by a kind of orientation – a brief explanation of the purpose and significance of the study, and the importance of their involvement in the undertaking. Interview with the teacher respondents followed after the retrieval of the questionnaires to clarify some information, confirm their responses and to find out and probe the problems they have encountered in the use of DepEd materials.

Results

Table 1. Summary of the Teacher Respondents Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30 years and below</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor of Elementary Education</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Specialization</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB-MLE Training Programs Attended</td>
<td>Local Trainings</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of the Teacher Respondents on the Criteria in the Evaluation of Instructional Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Descriptive Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.9598</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization and Presentation</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.9874</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.8317</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.8512</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.0004</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.9780</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.0104</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Equity and Accessibility</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.0975</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.9805</td>
<td>MODERATELY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scaling:
- 4.21-5.00 = Strongly Agree
- 3.41-4.20 = Moderately Agree
- 2.61-3.40 = Undecided
- 1.81-2.60 = Moderately Disagree
- 1.00-1.80 = Strongly Disagree

http://ijhss.net/index.php/ijhss
Table 3. Interviews with the Grade 1 Teacher Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Summary of Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you find the instructional materials used in teaching Mother</td>
<td>Majority of them affirmed that the Meranaw instructional material is useful and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue (Meranaw) language? Do you find it useful and beneficial in your</td>
<td>beneficial in their teaching. The material is useful because it serves as their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching? Why?</td>
<td>reference and guide in teaching the subject. It is beneficial because it naturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arouses the interest of the pupils since they could grasp the idea right away by just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are all your Grade 1 pupils using Meranaw as their mother tongue?</td>
<td>Out of 79 teacher respondents, 28 whose pupils are non-Meranaw and 12 admitted that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the language preferences of your pupils? How does the</td>
<td>they have Meranaw pupils but whose mother tongue is not Meranaw. This is where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional material work in your class with different language</td>
<td>multilingual education, bilingual education and translation method become a necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferences?</td>
<td>in the remediation effort in this kind of situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost all the respondents have the same responses namely orthography, vocabulary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shortage of materials, vagueness of some images, different language preferences of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the pupils, unchallenging task, and lack of other references to support the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there problems you encountered in using the localized instructional</td>
<td>All of them acknowledged the great difference between the other language textbook they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials produced by DepEd? What are those problems? What can you</td>
<td>used before and the Meranaw material they are using now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest to remedy the encountered problems?</td>
<td>Some respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with the materials due to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problems they encountered. On the other hand, many of them expressed their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction because they find it effective, for them this is the best practice way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you compare the materials in Meranaw that you use now with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other textbooks you used before?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generally speaking, how do you assess the instructional materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does it affect the performance of the pupils?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussions
Many (26 of 79 respondents or 32.91%) of the teacher respondents were 30 years and below. This implies that a greater number of the teacher respondents were young, energetic, and new to the teaching profession; it is possible that some of this number could be considered novices in the profession or service, but as children of their time, brimming with fresh or innovative ideas. The findings also show that majority (55 of 79 respondents or 69.62%) of the respondents are Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd). This implies that the teachers assigned to teach in Grade 1 in public schools have met the minimum requirement to teach in the primary level. It is immediately apparent that a big number (34 of 79 respondents or 43.04%) of the respondents have General Education as their field of specialization; they are thus generalists. This result suggests that most of the teachers involved in this study may be presumed to be sufficiently competent to teach primary level pupils with different subject areas, considering that they have undergone pre-service training in their baccalaureate courses. Since the General Education
course is only recently introduced in colleges and universities, this implies that they are adequately competent or skilled to handle MTB subject as part of the K to 12 Curriculum.

The overall on the teaching experience reveals congruence or consistency with data on age and highest educational attainment. Almost half (39 of 79 respondents or 49.38%) of the total number of teachers have only 1-5 years in service to their name, which implies that they are still relatively new in the profession. This suggests that they should go after opportunities to accumulate rich and varied experiences and make the most of chances to upgrade essential competencies to develop a greater sense of self-efficacy, and more effectively handle the teaching-learning process. In addition, 38 or 48.10% have joined local training programs, that is, at the division and school levels. The finding implies that very few professionals have had the opportunity to attend seminars in different levels, specifically the national and international levels. This is understandable as the respondents are public school teachers at the lowest rung of the school bureaucracy.

The implication that can be drawn from the results is, among the aspects or features of instructional materials in teaching mother tongue language considered in this study, the teacher respondents perceived its assessment methods as the biggest strength since they were found to be appropriate and suited to the learning objectives, that is, test and examinations are suited to goals and pupils ability and easily assess what has been learned. On the other hand, they perceived equity and accessibility as the lowest aspect. The latter seems to corroborate a common observation mentioned in recent studies like those of Diampuan-Sarip (2013) and Ambor (2013) that there is a dearth of instructional materials for MTB-MLE use and that this insufficiency spells a serious setback. This is supported by work done by Malone (2010, 2012). Malone recommends that a preliminary research on the educational situation of the schoolchildren in the community should precede MTB-MLE implementation. To be critically examined are percentage of learners’ access to school, number of teachers trained in the language of instruction (LOI), use of the medium of instruction (MOI), availability of MTB reading materials and assessment tools.

With regards to the problems encountered in using the localized (Meranaw) instructional materials, almost all the respondents have the same responses. The main problem disclosed or shared by the teacher respondents interviewed was the spelling of words or orthography. This is a function of the lack of standardized orthography for Meranaw. This kind of situation inevitably causes difficulty to the pupils in their reading activities. Another problem identified is the depth or complexity of some words, or the vocabulary. Both teachers and pupils complained that there are words or lexical items they do not understand, these must include residue from classical Meranaw or archaic terms that have fallen into disuse. The ‘depth’ or ‘rarity’ of the words used in the materials creates challenge to everyone using the material; this constitutes another complication.

The limited supply of material to the schools was also a problem faced by the teachers. Not all teachers especially in big schools that have many sections, were given a copy of the material. Indeed, learners were not also supplied with the material. There was no way they could purchase it because it is not for sale in the bookstores. Another problem is the vagueness of some images. Some pictures in the material can no longer be identified due to blurredness. The respondents hope that images be more clear and attractive so that no one will not have difficulty in identifying some pictures. As mentioned earlier, some teachers revealed to have Meranaw pupils whose mother tongue is not Meranaw and some pupils who are non-Meranaw. According to them, they help these students to cope by resorting to translation technique as in the Concurrent Method popularly used in bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the United States,
but eventually these pupils find it hard to perform better and get higher grades. Teacher respondents said that some of the lessons and activities in the material are not suitable to the ability level of the pupils. Some activities in the material are very easy.

All of the respondents acknowledge the great difference between the reading textbooks used in other subject language areas such as English and Filipino which they used before and the Meranaw material they are using now. The English and Filipino textbooks, compared to the Meranaw material, are very presentable, durable, available, and complete with all the glossary, index and the like, but difficult to deliver and discuss. Teachers have to employ different techniques, strategies and methods to attract the attention of the pupils and to motivate them to be participative.

On the other hand, with the Meranaw instructional material, one does not have to exert extra effort to have an interactive class because there are no barriers. The material deals with context which are closer or familiar to the pupils. They are able to identify themselves with the characters given in the lessons. They can relate and understand what is being talked. However, this flow of lively discussion is limited to speaking. They struggle when it comes to reading and writing Meranaw. The teacher respondents noticed that the pupils prefer to read and write Filipino.

Conclusion
From the foregoing findings, it can be concluded that the teacher respondents are not well informed regarding the MTB-MLE for lack of adequate orientation and preparation. Successful implementation of the program demands some conditions or essentials: teachers trained in MTB-MLE, proficiency in the language of instruction, knowledge of the languages of other learners, proper monitoring and evaluation, supportive learning environment to which parents and the entire community contribute, and instructional materials in adequate supply and the teaching skills, methods and strategies that go with the use of these materials.

The problems met by most of the respondents can somehow show be attributed to their young age and little experience in teaching and inadequate training in MTB education. Adult teachers might have less problems with difficult Meranaw words and sounds than the younger generations have. Ironically, the latter themselves betray their own alienation from their culture. Their problem with Meranaw vocabulary and phonology is elementary. MTB-MLE must be adopted with conviction, commitment, and sincerity. Each MTB-MLE teacher must believe or have a full appreciation of the nobility of the endeavor.
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Appendix 1

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1. Profile of the Respondents

Direction: Please fill in the blanks.

1. Name: (optional) _____________________________________________________
2. Age: ________
3. Educational Attainment: _____________________________________________
4. Field of Specialization: ______________________________________________
5. Teaching Experience: _______________________________________________
6. Mother Tongue Based-MultiLingual Education (MTB-MLE) Training Programs
   Attended: _______________________________________________________

Part II. Evaluation on the Department of Education (DepEd) Localized Instructional Materials
for Teaching Meranaw Language for Grade One.

Direction: Please check your chosen answer. Use the following rating scale.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
3 = undecided
4 = moderately agree
5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria in the Evaluation of Instructional Materials</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aligns with curriculum and learning competencies of pupils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is age appropriate and is designed to meet the needs of individual learners from various skills levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The principles of language learning and language acquisition have been followed in developing the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities are short and varied which are likely to match the attention span, interest and difficulty level of the learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The contents are appropriate for the local context and meet community standards for language content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The use of language and expression is acceptable and understandable to the learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The material is accurate, have used proper grammar and spelling and free of all errors before they are sold to school districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contains vocabulary, sentence structure, and concepts appropriate for the intended grade level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Material stimulates growth in factual knowledge, literacy appreciation, aesthetic values and ethical standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. ORGANIZATION AND PRESENTATION

11. Content and directions are clear and understandable and follow an organized and unified pattern.

12. Requirements for the teachers are clearly stated.

13. The appendices are sufficient and conveniently organized.

14. Illustration cover and general format is attractive and durable.

15. The methods of presentation are based upon good learning theory.

16. The size of the material is appropriate for use at an intended level.

17. Visual aids help clarify or enhance the content of the curriculum.

18. Visual images illustrations reflect local realities and suited to the level of learners.

19. Appropriate use of font size and format intended grade level.

20. Is well organized and contains appropriate aids (e.g. index, glossary, guides) is user friendly.

### C. EQUITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

21. Material is durable, easily stored, transported and accessible.

22. Material is updated and is adaptable and customizable to match the resources of the school.

23. Material works properly without purchase of additional components.

24. Material can be used by all pupils without extensive supervision or special assistance.

25. It achieves an acceptable balance between knowledge about the language and practice in using the language.

### D. ASSESSMENT

26. There is an observable performance that is relevant to real world experiences and that can be used to measure pupil engagement.

27. Assessment methods are appropriate and suited to the learning objectives.

28. Tests and examinations are suited to goals and pupils ability and easily assess what has been learned.

29. Evaluation instruments are appropriate for measuring reaction, learning and/or behavior.

30. Material offers assessment opportunities that genuinely measure progress in the foundations of reading.

### E. APPEAL

31. Material gains and holds the interest of the pupils.

32. Visual aids to learning are provided when appropriate as motivation instruments.

33. Material is authentic in terms of text and task.

34. Facilitates a wide range of communicative activities that reflect various learning.

35. Material is securely bound and instructions are clear.

### F. EFFECTIVENESS

36. The material is effective in facilitating short-term memory.

37. The communicative tasks are useful in providing learning opportunities for the learners.

38. The activities in each unit are linked to each other in ways which help the learners.

39. The proportion of the material devoted to the development of reading skills is suitable for learners.
40. Material stimulated interaction and achieves impact.

G. EFFICIENCY
41. There is an efficient way to refer to specific content.
42. Material helps learners to feel at ease and develop confidence.
43. Tasks are credible and achievable.
44. Material is appropriate for the subject area and for the age, emotional development, ability level, learning style, and social development of the students for whom the materials are selected.
45. Material has aesthetic, literary and/or social values.

H. GENERAL SATISFACTION
46. Instructional material design is very satisfactory.
47. The content of this instructional material is very practical, teachable and flexible.
48. The material has motivating power.
49. Material encourages learners to apply their developing language skills to the world beyond the classroom.
50. Administrative support and assistance are provided to teachers.

*Adapted and modified based on:

Strachchota, E., et.al. (2006)
David Coleman and Susan Pimentel (2011)
Brian Tomlinson (2003)
Andrea H. Penaflorida (1991)
“Dakar Academy General Criteria for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials” (2011)
“Criteria for Selection of Instruction Materials” (N.D.)
“Instructional Materials Evaluation Criteria-Early Childhood Rubric” (N.D.)
“Criteria in the Evaluation of Instructional Materials” (N.D.)